

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action mailed April 6, 2007, the Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8-14 and 16-20 and objected to claims 4, 7 and 15. The Examiner expressly indicated that claim 4 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, but did not include any such statement in the Office Action with respect to claims 7 and 15. Since the Examiner had only objected to claims 7 and 15, Applicant assumes that claims 7 and 15 would also be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Accordingly, claims 4, 7 and 15 have been amended by this response to rewrite them in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the drawings as not showing the “non-linear fashion.” Applicant respectfully disagrees. The phrase “non-linear fashion” appears in claims 4 and 15 and is used to describe the taper of the central section of the obturator tip. According to claims 4 and 15, the central section of the obturator tip connects the proximal and distal ends of the obturator tip.

In paragraph [0015] of the specification, the central section is identified by reference designator 20. FIGS. 1-3 clearly show the central section 20 tapering from the distal end to the proximal end of the obturator tip in a non-linear fashion.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner’s objection to the drawings should be withdrawn.

The present application is in condition for allowance, and such action is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

June 21, 2007
Date



Clarence E. Eriksen
Registration No. 27,734
Clarence E. Eriksen & Associates, P.C.
Nine Greenway Plaza, Suite 3100
Houston, Texas 77046
(713)-572-3700 - Telephone
(713)-572-3703 - Facsimile

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS